

Interview Summary

Applicati n No.

09/625,017

Applicant(s) **#114**

LEVINE, DAVID

Examiner

John W Hayes

Art Unit

3621

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John W Hayes. (3) _____.

(2) John Galbreath. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 December 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Logan and Daniele.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

John W. Hayes
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed limitations to claims 1 and 20 related to a sample of the prior use by a plurality of users and dividing the subscription fees of the plurality of users based on the updated metric which comes from the single user. This proposed feature appears to distinguish the present invention from the Logan and Daniele references pending further review by the examiner. These proposed changes will be further considered upon formal submission of the amendment.